WT ARTIKEL

WISSENSCHAFFTPLUS

LK-Verlags UG



THE VIRUS

Misconception

Corona simple and understandable

Part III

Dr Stefan Lanka

The Virus Misconception Part III

Corona simple and understandable

Dr. Stefan Lanka

In the previous articles „The Virus Misconception“ Part I+II, the history and developmental steps have been presented as to why and how the people of the industrialised countries slid into the Corona Crisis. In order that this crucial knowledge can be better understood, disseminated and used effectively, the decisive points are listed here. This information will be made understandable through animation in an until now unique video series, announced in this issue.

The aim of our engagement is that humanity can emerge stronger from this lesson-rich

crisis and become mindful and enduring as a whole. We are sure that the topics of biology, society and the self-image of human beings, to whose constructive development we contribute, as well as the topics of the monetary system and the rule of law, which we know to be significant, belong together and are the basis of a constructive development of humanity.

How it began

The people of our cultural system are taught - something that is no longer questioned today and is regarded as a fact that - biological life came into being by chance, by molecules colliding and interacting with each other by chance. These molecules are presumed to have been created by atoms accidentally colliding with each other, which in turn are said to have been created out of nothing in a Big Bang. It is assumed that within a sphere of water, which is said to be held together by a shell of fats and proteins, so many molecules with certain properties came together in the distant past that the interactions of the molecules, called metabolism, would maintain and multiply this sphere itself.

This presumed model of a sphere, which despite all the assurances, pictures and schematic drawings in the textbooks has no correspondence in reality, is described as a cell. It is claimed that all life arose by chance from a simple primordial cell. After death, it is claimed that nothing else would remain except molecules, which can also decay back into atoms. Only those molecules that enter a cell are said to be part of life, everything else is dead, cold, even space is empty, all lacking any life force and independent interaction possibilities. Life, it is assumed, only developed into more complex organisms such as trees or humans because some accumulations of cells, so-called living beings, are stronger and more sophisticated in order to reproduce more quickly at the expense of others. If you look at the power and economic structures throughout the development of our cultural system until

the present time, it is obvious that the respective attitude towards life and view of the opinion shapers continues to set the model for the concept of biological life.

Perhaps the most essential cause of this one-dimensional and dangerous world view is the mind, also so-called ‘rationality’, when it is considered absolute and the insights generated with it are not allowed to be questioned further. When the mind becomes the ruler and is not recognised and used as one of several available tools to approach the phenomena of life. In order to help us understand this and face this challenge, Jochen Schamal has written a basic introduction in his article Mathematics and Reason in this issue 3/2020 of w+, in which he has identified the core and fundamental challenge facing human beings. If the mind is used as an aide to humankind, everything is

fine; if it is made absolute, we automatically end up ‘in Corona’, in manifest wars and in many areas of life, in self-perpetuating good-evil mechanisms. The undoubted effects of these good-evil mechanisms are interpreted by the mind as proof of the existence of an active principle of evil.

If we look at life “objectively” in the positive sense of the word, we see only creative processes of cooperation, of symbiosis, that express and increase the joy of life as the driving force for life. Even in the triggering of those processes that we wrongly interpret as diseases and as malignant, we find only helpful mechanisms and processes when we observe them objectively. Events or perceptions that are threatening or perceived as existentially threatening have been identified as the triggers. After they are triggered, the affected

bodily functions, but also the processes of the psyche, perception and behaviour, increase or change in order to escape the situation or make it survivable. Where it makes sense, tissues are built up or broken down for this survival purpose.

In the recovery process, which commences instantaneously when the triggering event ceases to exist or the relationship to it can be put into perspective, the body then tries to restore the original form by breaking down or building it up again. Complications can arise because one or more triggers had a long and intensive effect, overlapped with other triggers, or new triggers were added through diagnostic shocks or resulting life circumstances. In these cases the healing and its known processes are made more difficult. Healing is also impeded if the triggering events are mentally and

psychologically clung to and if deficiencies and poisoning are at work. In this issue of w+ we present the book Universal Biology, which introduces this point of view. These insights were gained by the physician Dr. Ryke Geerd Hamer from 1981 onwards through very precise observations. Unfortunately, Unfortunately, Dr. Hamer himself stood in the way of the dissemination of his constructive medical discoveries due to his unobjective polemics.

Dr. Hamer thus significantly developed the previous psychosomatic science, which had its peak in Germany in 1977 but lost its way in material attempts at interpretation. By individualising the observations, detached from biochemical and genetic attempts of interpretation and by discovering specific signals in the brain - specific for all physical and

mental processes of triggering, healing and healing crises, this view became scientific. His observations and the explanations derived from them are verifiable, comprehensible, the processes are predictable, which is how correct diagnoses, causal therapy and effective prophylaxis are possible. Very importantly, this means that the negative death sentences “incurable” and “malignant” can be made accessible to understanding and lose their destructive effect.

It is understandable that people who only permit known and physical explanations for life, health, illness, recovery and old age as real, have difficulties with this view. The same applies to people who base their self-confidence and identity on this view or who derive their livelihood from it. In her article “What you and others can learn from Corona”

in this issue of w+, Ursula Stoll shows why people react aggressively when confronted with another view and what you can do not only to avoid this but to awaken genuine interest in the other view. This is absolutely necessary. It is likely that we will only get out of the increasing self-mechanisms that led to the Corona crisis if a large majority of people open up to a better understanding and leave the destructive ideas and resulting mechanisms behind. From this perspective, Corona proves to be an opportunity for all and a turning point towards a leap in humanity's development. It is unlikely and perhaps even dangerous if these new insights, which challenge the old view and the industries attached to it, are dictated or proposed "from above".

The virus as a disease agent

Diseases, pain, even old age and death of the body are seen in “our” present, purely material world view as defects to be fought. Promises of cures and eternal life are regularly made, which the “grateful population” (Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy 1956) acknowledge with increasing sums of money for the promises. Since 1858, it has been supposed that all life arises from a cell as a result of purely material processes, but also all diseases, in that, the cell is said to produce disease products, disease venoms, in Latin viruses. Until 1951, the idea of a virus was defined as a disease agent, a toxic protein, a toxin. In the years before, some scientists did actual science, checked their assumptions, namely by control experiments. In doing so, they found two things: The decomposition of completely healthy tissues and organs also

produces the same proteins as the decomposition of “diseased” material, which were misinterpreted as viruses. Furthermore, the method of animal testing rather than the proteins misinterpreted as viruses cause the symptoms that were interpreted as triggers and carriers of the disease.

Only a few doctors and only attentive readers of professional journals noticed that science, as it had often been in the past, was for a time without a fixed idea of what viruses actually are. The idea of viruses has always been used for this purpose: a failed attempt to explain actual phenomena that cannot be explained within the respective world view. Since the assertion and application of alleged virus testing procedures, the inherent mechanisms of fear generation have been running faster and faster. The creation of fear is becoming

increasingly globally effective because of the industrialisation of the detection techniques and because of the market economy-induced synchronisation of “information.” The current result: a self-blockade of the industrialised countries and their population through an insane lockdown, which is justified pseudo-rationally, i.e. pseudo-scientifically. It has not yet become apparent and acknowledged that a purely rational approach to the phenomenon of life, which excludes compassion and other possibilities of perception, itself becomes a good-bad religion that wants the good, but creates the evil in the process. Any claim to absoluteness about life, about illness and recovery is dangerous and immediately leads to life-destroying consequences, even within the so-called Hamer system of knowledge, if it is set in absolute terms and viewed in isolation,

because we, as participants in life, lack an overview of the whole.

Within this pure material cell theory of life, introduced in 1858 in an extremely unscientific way, which very quickly became the global basis of biology and medicine, a restricted view of the phenomena of life, a dangerous forced logic and a forced action automatically result. If I explain life purely materially, the triggers of age, deviations from normality (=diseases), the simultaneous or clustered occurrence of symptoms can and will be interpreted only as material defects and attributed to the action of assumed traveling disease agents. The disease processes and disease carriers have to be fought and suppressed within this idea. The notions of antibiosis, antibiotics, radiation, chemotherapy and isolation were therefore invented. In 1976, Ivan Illich showed in his book

Medical Nemesis that medicine is also subject to the pressure of profit and therefore forces those involved to exaggerate. For this reason alone, medicine is automatically, insidiously and unnoticed, becoming more and more dangerous in many areas. This compulsion to exaggeration thereby also makes the false belief in the virus more and more dangerous.

The wrong hypothesis of the cell, with which the wrong assumption of the virus, which had previously been abandoned, was revived, constitutes the basis of the emergence not only of the infection, immune and gene theories, but also the dominant basis of our cancer medicine. Whoever regards cancer as error, arbitrariness, self-destruction of nature, believes in wandering evil, the idea of metastases, therefore also believes in flying metastases, aka viruses. Here the circle closes.

Education and information about “Corona”, in which these crimes are not named, automatically strengthens these foundations and misconceptions, which have been the cause of Corona.

From the material view on life results another, deeper coercive logic, namely that of material heredity. It is assumed within the present science that only material interactions exist and all other explanations are unscientific and idiotic. Hence, the only possibility of thinking that remained led to a construction and function plan of life. One that contains instructions on how the alleged cell produces an organism with the help of its constituent molecules and the energy currents gathered in it. Until 1951 the prevailing public opinion claimed that proteins would carry the construction and functional plan of life. It was

believed that proteins were the carriers of the hereditary substance. Within this imaginary world a hereditary substance MUST be claimed in order to be able to explain the origin of organisms from a cell. So also the claimed toxic proteins, the viruses, the pre-1951 definition of viruses, were attributed the property that they would also carry in their claimed protein toxin the blueprint to reproduce themselves.

The change of ideas in virology

Since 1952, when the idea that the hereditary substance is the material found in the nuclei of tissues and cells “finally” prevailed, there has been a change of ideas, the so-called paradigm shift, regarding viruses. Since this paradigm shift, viruses were and are claimed to be traveling genetic elements, which, after

entering the cell, would force the cell to reproduce the virus. In this assumed multiplication, the cells are supposed to be damaged, thereby causing diseases. The class of molecules considered to be hereditary since 1952 are known as nucleic acids because they behave like a weak acid in aqueous solution and are mainly found in the center, the nucleus. Until the year 2000, it was believed that segments could be found in these molecules, some of which are very long, that would carry the blueprint for the construction and function of life. Genes were described as the smallest unit of the hereditary substance, and they were thought to carry the information about how proteins are constructed. However, the results obtained experimentally in biochemical genetics disproved all previous assumptions. In view of these results, no scientist and no one today is able to formulate

a tenable definition of a gene that has not been disproved long ago.

In each nucleus the composition of the nucleic acids is constantly changing and for about 90% of our proteins no “genetic templates” can be found which could be called genes. The nucleic acid probably serves primarily as an energy releaser and only secondarily as a metabolic resonator and stabiliser. With the exception of some researchers, almost all employed biologists and physicians cling to the idea of a hereditary substance despite the known refutations because they simply have no other idea and their imagination suffers from pressure to conform and career anxiety. For this reason, the refutation of all previous assumptions about material heredity, virology should also have said goodbye for the second time long ago because the genetics underlying

today’s virology turned out to be a misinterpretation.

A virus has been defined as a non-living pathogen consisting of a piece of dangerous hereditary substance made up of several genes, which can be found in an envelope or can be completely naked. The assumption is that this strand of genetic material enters a cell, the viral genetic material takes control of the cell and forces it to reproduce the virus, damaging or even killing first the cell and eventually the whole organism. It is thought that after multiplying, the virus leaves the damaged organism to damage other organisms. This theory is refuted by the refutation of the cell theory, since life is mainly organised in interconnected tissues and in reality there are very few structures that can be called cells [*see translator’s note]. The virus theory is

refuted by the refutation of genetics. The virus theory is refuted by an improved understanding of biology, the discovery of those symbiotic processes in disease, healing and the healing crises which confirm through all previous observations that existentially long-lasting events or perceptions trigger the potentially multiphasic processes which have hitherto been misinterpreted as different diseases. Knowledge of biology refutes virology. In real life there is no principle of evil that merely takes and gives nothing.

The refutation of the whole of virology, easily recognised by everyone

Virology claims to isolate viruses in the laboratory and from claimed isolated particles, claims to find the genetic material to determine

their structure. In no publication claiming an isolation of a virus is there a description of an actual structure that has been isolated. On the contrary, experimentally produced death of tissues in the laboratory is misinterpreted as the effect of viruses because it is assumed that the tissues would die because supposedly infected body fluids are added. In reality, the tissues die because they are no longer nourished and are killed by toxic antibiotics. Never, except for the measles virus trial, have the tissue control experiments been carried out that disprove the virus assumption, because the tissues always die from starvation and poisoning without the need to add additional supposedly infected material.

On the basis of a single publication from 1954 [https://pubmedinfo.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/propagation-in-tissue-cultures-of-cytopathogenic-agents-from-patients-with-

measles.pdf], the decayed tissue is assumed to transform into viruses when it dies. In this publication, it is emphasised several times that the assumption of tissue death due to a virus and the assumed transformation of the tissues into viruses is only speculation that would have to be proven or disproven in the future. It was only through the subsequent Nobel Prize for the first author, John Franklin Enders, for an earlier speculation within the old, protein-toxin virology, that this tissue-to-virus conversion speculation became a supposed scientific fact and the sole basis of the new, genetic virology.

The model for the new virology was and is from the bacteriologist John Franklin Enders - the discovery of tiny structures called phages that are only visible using the electron microscope, into which highly inbred, i.e. incestuous, bacteria transform when their metabolism

breaks down. This transformation is not an act of destruction, but a metamorphosis, similar to when bacteria gradually lose their conditions for living and form their permanent forms, the spores. These are also tiny, much smaller than bacteria. Spores can change back into bacteria when the living conditions are optimised again. Phages, on the other hand, offer their nucleic acid to other organisms, which they thus help to live and do NOT kill or harm. Phages are nevertheless regarded as the viruses of bacteria, although phages are never able to damage or kill naturally occurring bacteria or freshly isolated bacteria. It is very likely that bacteria will develop again from phages if the environment for this is provided. I have isolated and studied a phage-like structure from the sea, one that algae produce especially when their living conditions are no longer optimal. Phages formed during the transformation of a

specific, highly inbred, i.e. an incestuous bacterial species, always have the same structure, the same size, the same composition and always an equally long and equally assembled nucleic acid. The nucleic acid, which always has the same length and composition, became the model for the new virus idea, the gene-virus theory, according to which a virus is a piece of enveloped or naked genetic material of a certain length and composition.

Phages are isolated quite easily from which their nucleic acid is extracted, which always has the same composition. In the case of “genetic viruses” this is never the case: no nucleic acid is ever taken from the few structures that can be visualised under the electron microscope and are passed off as viruses. The nucleic acid is explicitly always extracted from the fluids in which the dying tissues were located. Crucially, a whole nucleic acid is never found that has the

length and composition of those schematic drawings and descriptions of nucleic acids that virologists pass off as the genetic strand or genome of their respective viruses.

The alignment, the easily recognisable and essential refutation of all viral assumptions

Any interested layman will find in any claim of existence or isolation of disease-causing viruses that a long nucleic acid is theoretically constructed from very short pieces of nucleic acid released when tissues die, which is then passed off as viral nucleic acid in complete deception of both the scientist and everyone else. This laborious composition of the assumed viral nucleic acid, which can only be accomplished with fast computers and was much more cumbersome and done by hand at

the beginning of gene virology, is called alignment. Every layman recognises from the word alignment that a long, supposedly viral nucleic acid was only ever constructed theoretically. Never does the claim appear that from a (viral) structure or even from an "infected" liquid, an even remotely complete nucleic acid has been found, the determination of whose molecular sequence would correspond to the whole, only theoretically constructed nucleic acid.

Here the effective coercive logic to which virologists have been subject since 1954 becomes clear, when the assumption was made that tissues could also transform into viruses when they die, as very specific incestuously created bacteria do when they transform into phages, those helpful structures that are misinterpreted as viruses of bacteria. Since

short pieces of nucleic acids, from which the postulated disease-causing viruses, the viral hereditary strands are only mentally constructed, are found in every living being, all humans and animals can test “positive”, depending on the quantity and collection location of the sample to be tested. The more that is tested, the more positive results are produced, although such a test result does not and cannot have any significance for either health or disease.

In the case of Corona, it is particularly easy to see how virologists deceived themselves and others, which in this case escalated into global hysteria and the Corona crisis through the actions of the German virologist Prof. Christian Drosten. In an attempt to get a grip on the panic of a new outbreak of SARS triggered by a hysterical ophthalmologist, the virologists of

the Chinese government theoretically constructed a nucleic acid strand in the record time of one week by means of computer programmes, which they said was almost identical to harmless and difficult-to-transmit bat viruses. They used only nucleic acids contained in the fluid of a bronchial wash obtained from a person with died with pneumonia. In doing so, they did not use “cell cultures” in the laboratory to supposedly infect them in order to harvest the presumed virus from them as is common practice, nor did they claim to have obtained this nucleic acid from an isolated structure.

It is likely that the following is why the Chinese virologists theoretically constructed the nucleic acid of a “harmless” virus: in order to get a grip on the wave of fear triggered by the ophthalmologist of a believed new outbreak of

the dangerous corona virus SARS epidemic which might have resulted in the immediate overload of hospitals. Prof. Drosten, on the other hand, did not wait until the Chinese scientists published the final composition of their nucleic acid on 24.1.2020 to develop a test procedure to detect this allegedly new viral nucleic acid using the PCR method. In order to develop his test procedure, he selected completely different nucleic acids, which he knew to be present in every human being, even before the preliminary data on the alleged new viral gene sequence from China was published on 10 January 2020. These pieces of nucleic acids he selected, which do not come from the (constructed) genome strand of the Chinese virus, are the basis of his test procedure.

The biochemicals to detect the pieces of nucleic acids selected by Prof. Drosten by means of

PCR which do not originate from the Chinese virus model - were sent free of charge on 11.1.2020, “for humanitarian reasons”, to precisely these places where it was known that returnees from Wuhan were being tested. Positive test results were thus obtained from travellers from Wuhan, which were presented to the public from 20.1.2020 as proof of human-to-human transmission of the alleged new virus. The Chinese government had to bow to public pressure to accept a new epidemic because of this apparent evidence, although all of the 49 people in Wuhan with pneumonia of unknown origin were proven not to have infected family members, friends or hospital staff with whom they were in close contact.

Summarising the essentials to understand, to end and learn from Corona

There are no disease-causing viruses and, with knowledge of real biology, they cannot exist. Viruses are only constructed mentally by putting together very short pieces of nucleic acids, purely theoretically, into long pieces. These long mental constructs, which do not exist in reality and have never been discovered, are passed off as viruses. The process of mentally stringing together very short pieces of nucleic acid into a theoretical and long nucleic acid is called alignment.

Since short pieces of nucleic acids, of which viruses are thought to be composed, are released during all inflammatory processes, tissue formation, degradation and death, it is

clear that all people who experience inflammatory processes, tissue formation, degradation or death and from whom tissues and fluids are collected for testing will test “positive” with the nucleic acid detection technique PCR.

Similarly, people automatically test positive if, when tested by swabbing,

a.) too many mucous membranes are damaged,
b.) there is haemorrhaging as a result,

c.) the very sensitive olfactory bulb, a part of the brain, is mechanically injured in the nasal cavity, or

d.) simply a very large sample volume is taken,

because in the body, even in every natural body of water and in all seas, an astonishingly

intensive build-up and degradation of nucleic acids of all kinds is constantly taking place. Among them are always those from which the only apparent genetic strand of the virus was mentally constructed. The PCR virus test only detects very short nucleic acids that are claimed to be part of a virus.

The test procedure to detect the alleged new Corona virus was developed by Prof. Christian Drosten even before the nucleic acid of the alleged new Corona virus was “decoded.” The Chinese virologists who had mentally constructed the nucleic acid of the alleged new virus using alignment, claimed that it has not been proven that this virus has the potential to produce diseases. They assumed that the new virus was very similar to harmless and difficult-to-transmit viruses in animals.

The “positive” results of Prof. Drosten’s PCR test were used to justify the claim that the new virus was “definitely” detected and that there was easy human-to-human transmission. These rash actions of Prof. Drosten had the effect of escalating a local SARS hysteria in Wuhan (triggered by an ophthalmologist) to a global Corona crisis.

* For further information on the refutation of traditional cell theory, see previous articles in wissenschafftplus.de